DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 453 100 SO 032 671

AUTHOR	Dyer, Susan K., Ed.
TITLE	Beyond the "Gender Wars": A Conversation about Girls, Boys, and Education (Washington, D.C., September 14-15, 2000).
INSTITUTION	American Association of Univ. Women Educational Foundation, Washington, DC.
ISBN	ISBN-1-879922-27-4
PUB DATE	2001-00-00
NOTE	67p.
AVAILABLE FROM	AAUW Educational Foundation, 1111 Sixteenth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036 ($9.95). Tel: 202-728-7602; Fax: 202-463-7169; e-mail: foundation@aauw.org; Web site: http://www.aauw.org.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Diversity (Student); Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; *Gender Issues; *Sex Fairness; Sex Role; Sexual Identity; Social Science Research
IDENTIFIERS	American Association of University Women; Dialogic Communication; *Educational Issues

ABSTRACT

In September 2000, a symposium was convened by the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation to foster a discussion among scholars who study both girls' and boys' experiences in and out of school. Participants shared their insights about gender identity and difference, challenged popular views of girls' and boys' behavior, and explored the meaning of equitable education for the 21st century. Among the participants were Susan McGee Bailey, Patricia B. Campbell, Beatriz Chu Clewell, James Garbarino, Patricia Hersch, Michael S. Kimmel, Lynn Phillips, William S. Pollack, and Barrie Thorne. This report summarizes the key insights from the symposium and includes the following chapters: (1) "Which Girls? Which Boys? Putting Gender Identity in Context"; (2) "What Is Success? Defining an Equitable and Effective Education for Girls and Boys"; (3) "What If There Were a Gender War and No One Showed Up? Reframing the Issues"; and (4) "What Are the Priorities? Setting an Agenda for the Future." (Includes 17 endnotes.) (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 453 100

Beyond the "Gender Wars"

A Conversation about Girls, Boys, and Education

SO 032 671

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol L. Burnett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AAUW EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION

Published by the American Association of University Women
Educational Foundation
1111 Sixteenth St. N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202/728-7602
Fax: 202/463-7169
TDD: 202/785-7777
foundation@aauw.org
www.aauw.org

Copyright © 2001
American Association of University Women Educational Foundation
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States

First printing: February 2001 (6,400)
Art direction: Sabrina Meyers
Layout/Design: Julie A. Hamilton
Editor: Susan K. Dyer
Photos: Judy G. Rolfe

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 00-112083
ISBN 1-879922-27-4

Printed on recycled paper

205-01/6400 02/01

Beyond the "Gender Wars"

A Conversation about Girls, Boys, and Education

AAUW EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION

Table of Contents

Introduction v

Part 1

Which Girls? Which Boys? Putting Gender Identity in Context 1

Which Girls? *Which* Boys? 3

Differences Between and Among Girls and Boys 6

The Enduring Relevance of Gender 7

Part 2

What Is Success? Defining an Equitable and Effective Education for Girls and Boys 9

Equal Access: Getting Into the Classroom 10

Equal Outcomes 10

Social and Psychological Outcomes 11

Success Summarized 16

Part 3

What If There Were a Gender War and No One Showed Up? Reframing the Issues 17

Myths of Gender Wars 18

Questions of Nature or Nurture 24

Fighting the Last War 29

Part 4

What Are the Priorities? Setting an Agenda for the Future 31

Enhancing Research 33

Listening to Girls and Boys and Building on Their Strengths 34

Improving the Classroom 39

Summing Up 41

Endnotes 43

Biographies of Participants 47

AAUW Equity Library 55

Introduction

On September 14 and 15, 2000, the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation convened a historic symposium called "Beyond the 'Gender Wars'" to draw together scholars who study both boys' and girls' experiences in school. Planned in January 2000, the symposium was inspired by several developments over the last decade of research on gender and education.

AAUW conducted its first research in 1885, when it found that higher education was not injurious to women's health, contrary to popular belief. In 1992, more than a hundred years later, the Foundation released a catalytic report, *How Schools Shortchange Girls: The AAUW Report*, which reviewed national data and more than 1,300 studies of gender to conclude that girls and boys received a different quality and quantity of education in U.S. public schools. Unsurprisingly, the 1992 report and seminal works on girls' development by Carol Gilligan[1] and others sparked reaction. Christina Hoff Sommers, a fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and a former professor of philosophy at Clark University, charged that research on girls distorted evidence of girls' success, distracted public attention from the "real" victims in schools—boys—and promulgated a bias against boys' "natural" behaviors in the feminized classroom.[2] The comments of Sommers and others assume a conflict of goals and interests between boys and girls in school, whereby one sex is "sanctified" as the other is necessarily denigrated and boys and girls occupy opposing roles as either the victims or victors in education.[3] The ensuing fractious discussion of gender and education often assumed the troubling zero-sum logic of a "gender war," a classroom battle of the sexes that girls win only if boys lose and vice versa.

Forum moderator Ellen Goodman

It is more likely that both boys and girls face unique challenges in school and in their social development and that research on gender and education—whether it focuses on boys or girls—should ultimately benefit all students. This has been the assumption of the AAUW Educational Foundation, which has focused its research on the perspectives and experiences of girls and women, yet with an eye to the improvement of educational prospects for all students through the knowledge gained by viewing education from girls' and women's vantage points.

Among its goals for the symposium, the AAUW Educational Foundation wanted to hear how a group of the most prominent researchers studying boys and girls would respond to the gender wars metaphor and to the ways that their research is discussed and applied in a broader popular context.

Additionally, the Foundation wanted to convene scholars studying both boys' and girls' experiences, especially in the context of schooling and education, to identify areas of shared concern and consensus as well as differences of interpretation. Research on girls' psychological development and school experience has flourished since the 1980s, and more recent research includes comparable studies of boys. Yet scholars of both boys and girls rarely have forums specifically to exchange insights and identify common themes and concerns, despite the complementary nature of their research.

Finally, the Foundation wanted to hear about priority issues that have emerged from recent cutting-edge research on both sexes and determine the directives for social equity that researchers, policy-makers, educators, parents, and communities should embrace for this century. Taking stock of recent changes in the status of girls and women in school and the workplace and of recent research on boys, where do we go from here?

The "Beyond the 'Gender Wars'" symposium opened at the AAUW Educational Foundation with a daylong conversation among the researchers. Professor Barrie Thorne moderated this session. A two-hour public forum, moderated by syndicated columnist Ellen Goodman, was held at the National Press Club the next day. The standing-room-only audience of educators, policy-makers, reporters, and others concerned about gender, education, and equity heard a summary of the first day's discussion and posed questions to the panelists.

Symposium participants included some of the most respected and prominent researchers studying boys and girls' issues (full biographies appear at the end of the report):

Patricia Hersch and William Pollack
Michael Kimmel and Lynn Phillips

Susan Bailey, executive director of the Wellesley Centers for Women, professor of women's studies and education at Wellesley College, and principal author of *How Schools Shortchange Girls: The AAUW Report*

Patricia Campbell, president of Campbell-Kibler Associates, an educational research and evaluation firm

Beatriz Chu Clewell, principal research associate and director of evaluation studies and equity research at the Education Policy Center of the Urban Institute and co-author of *Breaking the Barriers: Helping Female and Minority Students Succeed in Mathematics and Science*

James Garbarino, professor of human development at Cornell University, co-director of the Family Life Development Center, and author of *Lost Boys: Why Our Sons Turn Violent and How We Can Save Them*

Patricia Hersch, journalist and author of *A Tribe Apart: A Journey Into the Heart of American Adolescence*

Michael Kimmel, professor of sociology at State University of New York-Stony Brook and author of *The Gendered Society* and *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*

Lynn Phillips, a social and developmental psychologist at Eugene Lang College of the New School University and author of *The Girls Report: What We Know and Need to Know About Growing Up Female* and *Flirting With Danger: Young Women's Reflections on Sexuality and Domination*

William Pollack, assistant clinical professor of psychology at Harvard Medical School, director for the Center for Men and Young Men and director of continuing education (psychology) at McLean Hospital, and author of *Real Boys: Rescuing Our Sons From the Myths of Boyhood* and *Real Boys' Voices*

Barrie Thorne, professor of sociology at the University of California, Berkeley, co-director of the Center for Working Families, author of *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School*, and moderator of the first day's session

This report summarizes the key insights that emerged from the conversation among researchers and the public forum. In the sections that follow, participants share their visions of what would constitute a truly equitable and effective education for girls and boys, their understanding of how gender interacts with other aspects of students' identities, their responses to and revisions of the gender wars debate, and their recommended priorities for achieving better education for boys and girls.

Part 1

Which Girls? Which Boys? Putting Gender Identity in Context

One has to ask, which girls, which boys? For example, the needs and problems of low-income African American boys and girls are quite different in some ways from the needs and problems of white, middle-class girls and boys.

—BARRIE THORNE

Participants in the "Beyond the 'Gender Wars'" symposium identified several social and cultural factors that will affect gender and education in the 21st century. They reviewed recent decades to acknowledge and celebrate the remarkable progress that girls and women have made educationally and professionally as embodied in everything from the emergence of the Women's National Basketball Association to women's participation in science to near parity in medical and law school enrollments to strong college completion rates for women. "In a generation, we have made incredible changes in terms of the tools that are available, the options that are available for at least middle-class girls. ... We have had a tremendous change in terms of even the things that are up for discussion," Campbell enthusiastically notes. "Think about a 17-year old [today] who thinks that she can do anything she wants to do in her life, as opposed to me, who wanted to be an engineer when I was in high school, and there were no schools in New York that would let women in." Clewell adds that exponential changes in women's status make it more imperative that researchers "constantly update what we know about women's status in different areas and reassess the data on indicators of progress. We have to keep doing that. We can't rely on what we knew before."

Patricia Campbell and Beatriz Chu Clewell

The rapid pace of economic and technological change also warns against complacency in research. Girls have made great strides in the life sciences, for example, but are still underrepresented in cutting-edge fields such as computer science and engineering. By the same token, stagnant college enrollment figures for some groups of young men, including blacks, may have especially dire consequences as the United States shifts away from an industrial economy and toward an information economy that rewards postsecondary education.

> I would like to say how much I want to celebrate the progress that's been made. When my daughter was four, she used to sit down and watch basketball with me. We lived in Chicago at the time. And finally one day she said, "Dad, is there a women's NBA?" and I said no. Today, I can say yes.
>
> —James Garbarino

Monumental changes in the educational and economic status of girls and women have occurred against a backdrop of demographic shifts and increasing diversity among school-age children. As Hersch observes, "Boys and girls share an increasingly complex, multicultural community," both within and outside of school, where gender identity is crucially mediated and shaped by other social characteristics such as a student's socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, linguistic status, immigration status, age, sexuality, and region. Clewell points out: "By 2035, the school-age population [in the United States] will be 'majority minority.' These changes have made it really important to factor in characteristics in addition to gender, such as race, ethnicity, culture, socioeconomic status, disability status, language minority status, and immigrant [status]. So we're in a time that really requires a different approach to doing research in this area."

Which Girls? *Which* Boys?

Projected demographic changes and increasing cultural heterogeneity make it especially injudicious or misleading to generalize about boys or girls in the abstract. Panelists questioned *which* girls or *which* boys are being described in the popular discourse about gender and education. "Race and class and ethnicity and sexuality [should] not be rendered invisible in some generic 'boy crisis,'

'girl crisis,' or any kind of essentializing argument about who's in trouble," Kimmel asserts.

Participants conceded that it is a daunting task, in practice, to integrate so many strands and variables of an individual's identity into the research process but affirmed its crucial importance, particularly given the demographic shift toward an increasingly diverse, "no-majority" culture. Moderator Thorne explains: "We have to keep trying to think about complexity and interrelationships. It's hard to do. It doesn't make for great sound bites, but that is the on-the-ground world we live in and that children are being brought up in."

Throughout the two-day event, participants offered examples of crucial differences among girls by race, ethnicity, immigration status, class, and many other characteristics. These examples undermine the notion of girls or boys as two homogeneous, generic groups with different and competing interests in education. Research from the early 1990s, for example, reveals that the general decline in girls' self-esteem attributed to early adolescence does not characterize the experience of black girls. Black and white adolescent girls also differ as groups on issues of body image, with black girls less likely to report negative body image or concerns about weight. The description of a decline in "girls'" self-esteem, then, erases the experience of black girls who, as a group, diverge from the generic girl being described.[4]

At the public forum a few audience members raised questions about the college enrollment gap in higher education favoring women (55 percent of undergraduates are women), yet this phenomenon, too, is more complicated when race, ethnicity, and class are considered. As Kimmel explains: "The gender gap between white males and white females in college admission is very small—51 percent are women and 49 percent are men. Yet only 37 percent of black college students are male and 63 percent female. Similarly, 45 percent of Hispanic college students are male and 55 percent female. This may be what sociologists call a deceptive distinction—something that looks on aggregate like a gender difference that's actually much more a race and ethnicity difference." Again, the generalization of differences between men and women as two groups occludes the strong influence of race and ethnicity in college enrollment.[5]

The interaction of gender, race, and ethnicity can also shape girls' and boys' attitudes toward academic achievement. Kimmel recalls an ethnographic study

of city schools where "black girls who take school really seriously are accused of 'acting white' and black boys who take schools seriously and do really well in school are accused of 'acting like girls.'"[6]

William Pollack and Barrie Thorne

Participants described other cultural differences in gender identity and experiences and their effect on school outcomes. Thorne observed that while the percentage of U.S. Latinas enrolled in college has gone up in recent years (from 24 percent in 1996 to 29 percent in 1998), the percentage of Latino males in college has declined (from 25 percent in 1996 to 18 percent in 1998). She summarized ongoing work by Julio Commarota, who is doing dissertation research on the educational trajectories of Latino youth in California. Commarota observes that lower-income Latino males, like black males, tend to be regarded with suspicion and heavily policed both in and out of school. Teachers often assume that Latino boys will be low achievers and that they pose a threat to school order, which leads the boys to disengage from school. In contrast, Latinas are less likely to be policed and criminalized and, consequently, more likely to engage with schooling and to develop social networks that foster educational mobility. Thorne commented that immigrant parents from Asia and the Middle East tend to be especially protective of their daughters. Although confining, this protectiveness usually keeps girls away from the temptations and dangers of street life. Their brothers have more spatial autonomy and are more likely to get into trouble. The conceptions of masculinity and femininity—and

of risk and danger—in these communities differ markedly from those in suburban, white, middle-class communities, with corresponding effects on educational outcomes. Generalizations about girls' or boys' trajectories gloss over this variation.

Finally, participants perceived that racial and ethnic differences, especially, code how the media, educators, and other adults depict boys and girls. While critics have charged that feminist research casts girls in the role of victims, Phillips and others note: "The media frames ... boys as villains and girls as victims, but again, when you break it down by race and class, there is certainly a strain that says girls are victims *or* they're villains. So, pregnant teens, for example, are the reason for all of our social ills."

Differences Between and Among Girls and Boys

Participants cautioned against generalizations that do not recognize variation by race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and other characteristics. Similarly, they underscored that differences between boys and girls as groups are in many ways less dramatic and interesting than the differences among boys and girls and, of course, the differences between individuals. "In the whole 'girls are ..., boys are ...' phenomenon, we forget that the within-group differences are greater than the between-group differences," Campbell asserts. "Whenever you say [that], people say, 'Well, of course,' and then go back to talking, acting, researching, and making policy as if there were no overlap—as if we had 'girls' over here and 'boys' over there. And how we get people to put that—the within-group differences are greater than the between-group differences—in their lives, in their research, and in their conversations, to me, is probably the biggest challenge we have."

Kimmel objects to the interplanetary view popular in vernacular works on gender such as John Gray's *Men Are From Mars, Women Are From Venus*: "We're neither Martians nor Venusians, but Earthlings, and we have far more in common than we have different, and the differences among men and among women are much more interesting than the differences between them." Phillips echoes: "There are at least as many differences among boys and among girls as there are between them. We need a better understanding of how young people experience schooling not only as boys and girls, but as boys and girls from diverse backgrounds."

> This framing of either/or—kids understand it and they enact it ritually ... in girls against the boys, boys against the girls. ... But moments of "cooties" and girls against the boys, boys against the girls chasing games are only maybe 2 percent of the actual kinds of play and interaction that one can see, say, with fourth and fifth graders.
>
> —BARRIE THORNE

The Enduring Relevance of Gender

If the preoccupation with identifying differences between the sexes has magnified and sometimes overstated the significance of these differences, participants reiterated that gender is, nonetheless, a crucial strand of our individual identity, culture, institutions, and perceptions of education. For most participants the exploration and analysis of gender differences in education and human development has been at the core of their primary research. Gender is most certainly relevant, that is, to education and human development, but it is increasingly difficult to characterize or speak about gender generically, as if it were disembodied from the larger context of race, class, and other characteristics that substantially change how gender identity is experienced and how it affects educational outcomes.

Other factors cut across these differences and are equally important to understand, even if they cannot be assumed *a priori*. As Pollack discovered, the "boy code" may "vary from ethnic background, from [socioeconomic status] background," but across these differences and categories, "boys are shut down early on, lose their voice at an early age ... around the age of four or five."

Similarly, Kimmel remarks that men who feel powerless socially or economically nevertheless differ as a group from women in one crucial respect—these men have a sense of entitlement: "The question of power and powerlessness ... doesn't get us very far, it seems to me, unless we also factor into it the question of entitlement." Women in the early 1970s, he elaborates, often charged that "Men have power, therefore men must feel powerful. But men were saying ...

'What are you talking about? I have no power—my wife bosses me around, my kids boss me around, my boss bosses me around—I'm powerless.' ... They may feel powerless, but they also feel *entitled* to power. That's the difference between men and women in terms of power—not simply the powerlessness dimension but the question of entitlement."

As participants described, the concept of gender equity has acquired greater complexity and depth from its inception as a matter of equal access. Researchers increasingly view gender identity as inextricably enmeshed in and shaped by other aspects of social identity, including race, ethnicity, social class, region, immigration status, and sexuality. These complexities—which will only increase as the United States becomes more demographically and culturally diverse in the 21st century—make it hazardous to generalize about the experiences of girls or boys in the abstract. Media, policy-makers, educators, and researchers will need to think carefully about the populations they are describing and integrate other dimensions of social identity into the discussion of gender equity.

Part 2

What Is Success?
Defining an Equitable and Effective Education for Girls and Boys

Against the backdrop of tremendous strides in girls' and women's education and changes in boys' and men's identities, participants questioned throughout their conversation what "success"—truly equitable and effective education—would look like for girls and boys. They challenged some of the prevailing definitions of an equitable and successful education and offered several alternative or additional criteria.

Equal Access: Getting Into the Classroom

Participants identified equal access for girls and boys to educational resources and opportunities—particularly as ensured through Title IX, the federal law prohibiting sex discrimination in education, and other legislation—as a basic precondition for equity, yet not its final goal. As Campbell recounts the history of the gender equity concept: "We started with 'equity' meaning 'access.' And of course, if you don't let people in the room, nothing is going to happen." Yet Campbell and others agreed that an equitable school environment "starts with access, but ... goes beyond access," as Pollack summarizes. "We've tended to define [gender equitable education] in terms of legalistic issues ... [such as] equal access and Title IX," Bailey notes, "and in reality that doesn't get at the gender ideologies that are so rampant throughout the system. ... I don't think we've made too much progress in really addressing how it feels for kids in schools."

Beatriz Chu Clewell and James Garbarino

Equal Outcomes

Some participants elaborated that equitable education denotes not only equal access, but also equal achievement outcomes for groups of students. As Clewell explains, "The ideal situation would be a setting in which success could not be

predicted by a person's sex, their race, their ethnicity, or their level of income—that people would have not only equal access to opportunities but also equal outcomes." By this formulation, for example, students' sex would not predict their scores on the SAT or a mathematics or reading test, the likelihood that they would pursue a particular subject area, or the likelihood that they would attend college. Truly equitable schools would not only offer opportunities to all, but would also diminish the gaps between boys and girls *as groups* on key outcomes such as standardized test scores. "Effectiveness in schools should be measured by the school's ability to deliver the goods to whomever happens to be the client, regardless of sex, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status" and other factors, Clewell elaborates.

Social and Psychological Outcomes

The concept of gender (and social) equity as equal educational outcomes for boys and girls as groups—an ambitious goal in itself—has particular value because researchers can quantify it and make it tangible through indicators such as test scores. Participants had mixed feelings, however, about test scores and equal outcomes on academic measures as concepts of gender equity. Some saw these as the most reliable, albeit imperfect, measures currently available (and taken seriously). Others added that less concrete components and outcomes of education have an important place in the concept of equitable schooling as well. "Test scores are necessary but not sufficient" on their own to measure an equitable education for boys and girls, Kimmel remarks. Pollack similarly recalls that his interest in schooling and boys emerged out of studies of girls' self-esteem, which stimulated him to

> I would like to see schools where there are no longer gaps between boys and girls or among races or among social classes in different subject areas. ... Knowing what race someone is, knowing what gender someone is would not predict how well they're likely to do in any subject area on a standardized test. But I would like to see much more than that in schools [as well].
>
> —Lynn Phillips

"think about boys' sense of self and how important this is in learning and within learning and from learning. ... The only kind of outcomes—mostly measures that we have out there—are those more limited to [academic performance]. Not that those [outcomes] aren't important; they're very important. But they're not all there is."

Cultivating Students' Enthusiasm and Passion for Learning

As Campbell summarizes, "We have to look at outcomes in ways that are complex." Several participants envisioned genuinely equitable schools as places that produce equal academic outcomes while also nourishing boys' and girls' passions for subjects they might otherwise categorically reject as masculine or feminine. Phillips questions "how we help give shape to certain passions of boys and girls precisely because of the way we gender [subjects] and how can we undo some of that." For example, girls' enrollment in mathematics and science courses at the high school level roughly mirrors boys' enrollment—an equal outcome. Yet as Campbell remarks: "In terms of middle-class girls, all the increases in achievement [and] all the increased participation at the pre-college level have not translated into more girls going into the physical sciences, engineering, and fields like that in college. So, yes ... [we're] moving things up, but at the same time, we're also doing an excellent job of convincing girls that while you can do it, you shouldn't." Clewell and Campbell speculate that college-bound girls may pursue advanced mathematics and science courses to fortify their transcripts for the competitive admissions process, even though these girls are not necessarily inspired by the subject matter and may not have been "exposed to math and science as fun activities early on" in their education, as Clewell explains. Campbell summarizes, "We've moved from 'you can't' to 'you can, but you don't.'"

An additional characteristic (although a more nebulous one to quantify) of an equitable school, then, is that it fosters boys' and girls' enthusiasm and passion for nontraditional subjects in addition to their course enrollment and achievement in those areas.

In discussing the criteria for an equitable education, some participants described a gap between what is technically available to boys and girls and what students themselves *perceive* to be available or possible. We have made strides in providing services and options but perhaps less progress in creating a culture where parents, adults, peers, and educators support the choices boys

and girls might make so that options feel genuinely available and plausible. "If you go through the phone book," Phillips explains, "you can find all kinds of services that are technically available to boys and girls. If you ask boys and girls what's available, they'll say, 'Nothing,' or they'll say, 'That's available, but it's really for the white kids,' or 'That's available, but it's really only if you're at risk,' or ... 'Only boys can play there,' and so forth. So I think it's important to know technically what's available, but it's as important to know how people perceive

Susan Bailey and Patricia Campbell

the options and what we can do to bring the two together to make resources really more available for everybody." Recent research on girls, technology, and computer science has similarly found that, although not formally segregated by sex, computer clubs and informal spaces in middle and high schools often become identified informally by students as male spaces or domains.[7]

Participants described how the gap between technical and perceived choices for boys and girls also may inhibit their selection of courses, majors, or careers. Participants identified the persistent gender-typing of certain areas of the curriculum and career paths as an impediment to boys' development especially. While boys have always had access to subjects such as English and literature, for example, and men are increasingly gaining privileges such as paternity leave, participants doubted that these options feel truly available or feasible to many boys and men. Kimmel cites research on boys and their attitudes toward English, which some boys identify as "being for faggots"—a label they avoid at

all costs—and recalls that professor Catherine Stimson aptly characterized the cultural gendering of subjects when she coined the phrase "real men don't speak French." "Boys supposedly now have all kinds of opportunities to do things that they never did before," Pollack argues, "but they won't do them. They won't take the chance because they're going to be made fun of in some kind of way, just as men can take paternity leave in three or four major corporations, but when you study [the new fathers], they never take [it]."[8]

In some ways, participants concluded, we have had greater success at endorsing new educational and career paths for girls and women than for boys and men. Kimmel describes the "half a revolution" that allows girls to "decide to be a Christina Aguilera or Mia Hamm, but boys are stuck in a very narrow range of what's possible for them," in some measure because "it is easier to be a tomboy than a sissy" in this culture. Phillips and others doubted that boys' and girls' academic preferences or pursuits are shaped primarily by natural inclinations or differences between the sexes. Instead, they applauded changes in roles evident over the last few decades and recommended that we continue to "challenge the practices we engage in that make certain skills, characteristics, and opportunities seem inevitable for boys and others for girls." For example, when a non-traditional academic or career choice sparks negative social judgment among peers or adults, that choice is not so authentically available to boys or girls as adults may perceive based on technical accessibility alone. "It's a wonderful thing now when your daughter comes home and talks about wanting to be a doctor," Bailey illustrates. "It's still not such a great thing if your son comes home and wants to be a nurse."

Re-examining Cultural Values

Participants qualified that a genuine expansion of academic, professional, social, or personal options for both boys and girls—one hallmark of a truly equitable education—would require substantial changes in cultural perceptions and values. Currently, society tends to overvalue conventional measures of success, such as wealth, power, or professional status, and devalue those associated with conventionally feminine skills or attributes, such as caring for or nurturing others. "If we don't start valuing some of the things that women have traditionally been assigned—those roles and the things they've done well—we're never going to get to the point of offering a wide range of choices to men or to women," Bailey warns.

Garbarino expressed concern about the almost complete feminization of the staff in early childhood education programs and elementary classrooms. "Men who express an interest in early childhood education are almost universally discouraged from doing that," he observes. "Typically, preschool teachers make less than ... parking lot attendants. ... The figures are usually if not 99 percent women, then certainly close to it. ... [In higher grades] men begin to enter more onto the scene" as educators and teachers. By that point, however, patterns and preferences from early education are firmly established for boys and girls. Bailey adds that this is a "classic example of the ways in which there is status for things that are associated with men—status and pay—and lower status and lower pay for things that are traditionally associated with women. ... [The] older the student, the more likely the teacher is to be male and the more likely the salary is to be higher. ... These are some of the underlying values in our society we have to begin to question. If we don't question those, we're never going to get a situation where men and boys are going to have a genuinely equal range of choices."

What do we give value to in this society? It reverts to that. How is someone valued? Are they valued if they make a good living?

—BEATRIZ CHU CLEWELL

Similarly, Clewell, Phillips, Hersch, and others had reservations about the measurement of educational success and equity primarily in terms of how well schools equip girls or boys for roles in the economy or for particular career tracks in high-demand and high-prestige areas such as the sciences, engineering, or computer technology. Clewell critiques the tendency to define success by default according to the standard of white males whose activities "are rewarded by money," and Phillips challenges the tendency to see children and schools as "tools for our economic well-being." Phillips recommended a dual focus: equipping students to succeed according to prevailing definitions of that term (for example, by pursuing prestigious or lucrative careers) and questioning and broadening cultural standards of success. Hersch summarizes: "Ultimately, what we want to turn out are decent human beings who can find their way to a meaningful life and find a place for themselves in this country, wherever [that place] is, or in this world. ... We're losing sight of that totality in the fetish about tests and whether girls should have a chance in science. ... Of course girls should be able to choose science if that's their thing, but if they don't want to do science and they want to be a poet, great."

Building Skills for a Democratic Culture

Participants underscored that children spend the majority of their waking time in school, a place that not only produces educational outcomes but also heavily influences students' social and gender identities and interactional styles between the sexes. Participants envisioned equitable public schooling as a pillar of democratic society that imparts critical skills for students to understand themselves and their social roles. Among other qualities, successful schools encourage mutual respect, a bedrock of any diverse civic culture.

Campbell likens a successful school to a successful family where "everyone learns enough to be able to take care of themselves [and others] and to have choices in life." Others emphasized that schools should inculcate democratic habits of critical thinking and analysis. This skill is especially pertinent to girls and boys who are barraged by competing, often manipulative messages—especially about sex and gender identity—in the popular media. Schools should promote media literacy and cultivate skills by which boys and girls can navigate and interpret this material. Others emphasized that successful schools will help students draw on all of their strengths and aptitudes. "My vision of success is based in part on research on resilience," Garbarino remarks. Research on resilience has found that "Androgyny is one of the pillars of resilience, the combining of traditionally masculine [and] traditionally feminine attributes in the same person. ... Individuals would be allowed to sort out their identities based on individual predisposition rather than predetermined categories."

Success Summarized

To be sure, participants viewed equitable schools that work for both boys and girls as more than sites for formal mastery of the curriculum. In addition to other characteristics, equitable schools would promote equal access as well as equal academic or educational outcomes for boys and girls as groups; stimulate shared passions for all areas of the curriculum; create an environment in which academic and career choices are both technically available and socially acceptable for boys and girls; cultivate a critical awareness of gender roles and the skills with which to interpret, understand, and change them; and develop boys' and girls' competencies to use and lay claim to conventionally masculine and feminine strengths alike.

Part 3

What If There Were a Gender War and No One Showed Up? Reframing the Issues

Given the subtleties and complexities of their research, participants voiced dismay at the gender war (a reprise of the timeless battle between the sexes) as a metaphor for schooling, education, or human development. They viewed it as a political artifact created by adults rather than a constructive insight about the state of education or children's welfare. Clewell dismissed it as a tempest in a teapot, and Pollack quips, "I didn't know there was a 'gender war' until I got hit by a bullet" from it. As Thorne summarizes: "There are differences among us in disciplinary backgrounds, in research methods, in our sense of what counts as good or doubtful evidence. ... Some of us have studied mostly girls. Some have focused on boys. Some have focused on both. We have studied children and youth at different ages and in different class and race and ethnic contexts. But through all of these differences and disagreements, we share a strong sense of dismay that our many years of research and educational interventions on behalf of social justice and equity for all children have now been framed with a metaphor of a war. We are not war correspondents. We are here as scholars to correct a series of distortions ... of issues of gender in education. We agree that these distortions falsify the facts, skew an understanding of the problems, and do an active disservice to both boys and girls."

Patricia Hersch

Myths of Gender Wars

Participants outlined several fallacies of the gender wars metaphor, although Campbell humorously speculates that perhaps it is an apt selection after all: "Maybe the war metaphor actually does work ... [because] in a war the older people in power sit in safety somewhere, make all the decisions, and make careers and often money out of it. The young people don't have a whole lot of choice in the matter. They're up there in the front lines, they're the ones who get hurt, and interestingly enough, they're often the ones who are protesting the

war. ... The gender war doesn't seem to have a huge effect on what's going on in our country. Parents continue to try to do the very best for their kids, teachers continue to try to do the very best for their kids, ... [and] we've made a tremendous amount of progress."

The Myth of the Zero-Sum Game

Underlying the gender war metaphor is a troubling and misleading logic, participants commented, that gender issues are a zero-sum game where, as Bailey summarizes, "A win for one sex is a loss for the other." When framed as a contest over discrete resources, time, critical attention, or educational achievements, boys' and girls' issues emerge as oppositional, yet participants observed that both the problems and solutions for boys and girls in school are interdependent. Participants noted, for example, that understanding girls or boys requires understanding both as well as understanding the interaction of masculinity and femininity.

Participants acknowledged that although "we seem to be debating who has it worse, boys or girls, we know in a way that both boys and girls are being shortchanged in their education and in societal support," as Pollack argues. In some areas, especially in psychological development, "what holds girls back is also what holds boys back," Kimmel explains.

Michael Kimmel

Boys' reluctance to pursue certain fields because of gender stereotyping, for example, resonates for girls as well. Sexual bullying and teasing in school affects both boys and girls as victims and as perpetrators.[9] Boys may face homophobic taunts while girls grapple with other forms of harassment, but a hostile school culture of sexual harassment or bullying redounds on both sexes deleteriously. In terms of human development and academic achievement, notions of masculine and feminine attitudes, choices, tendencies, or pursuits can inhibit both sexes from exploring a range of interests. Pollack observes from his research on boys that they are negatively "straitjacketed" by a "boy code" that prescribes stoicism or emotional withdrawal just as girls historically have been circumscribed by a "girl code" of femininity.

Conversely, participants urged that we think about the benefits of programs in a more complex and far-sighted way. Participants explained that many programs for girls, for example, have benefited all students, including boys. Bailey recalls that mathematics and science programs initially developed to boost girls' interest and achievement revealed solutions that "were very helpful for boys as well. By looking at the girls, we saw a need for a program ... for many boys" struggling with mathematics and science as well.*

Participants debated the merits and effects of designating specific programs only for girls or only for boys, noting that such programs can perpetuate stereotypes and become self-fulfilling prophecies that girls can't do math, or they can invite a zero-sum argument that girls get special attention at the expense of boys.[10] "I would rather have those programs be based on ... how well you've done in math or your anxiety level" than by sex, Thorne explains. Participants concurred, however, that initiatives to address specific educational needs often have a reverberative, positive effect on education for all students.

Other participants challenged zero-sum thinking by distinguishing between short- and long-term changes. Phillips pointed out that programs may serve girls in the short term, but insofar as such programs become laboratories for better teaching and insights about learning, they benefit all students in the long run. Similarly, Kimmel sees long-term advantages for men and women in Title IX legislation that expanded girls' and women's sports opportunities: "Is it not better for boys and men to relate to women who are competent, confident, and efficacious in their own bodies—i.e., through the implementation of Title IX—than girls and women who are not? Surely it is."

Philosophically, participants envisioned gender equity as additional, not subtractional. It expands what children can and want to be, rather than confining them to sex-based clichés about their personality, preferences, or academic interests. Bailey illustrates that adult men who take advantage of paternity leave or rethink their priorities around work or professional life gain opportunities

* In fact, very few U.S. Department of Education budget dollars were designated specifically for programs to assist women and girls in education. The only program thus restricted was the Women's Educational Equity Act of 1994, which was authorized at $5 million out of a total Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I budget of more than $7 billion and funded at $3 million. This comprises less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the ESEA budget.

"to spend time with their children ... to care. Granted, [that] isn't valued in this society ... but we shouldn't back off from saying that it is valuable."

The Myth of the Embattled Researchers

The gender war motif conveys a false image of vying factions of researchers and policy-makers, each staking a claim to victory for their sex. (*New Yorker* reviewer Nicholas Lemann wryly imagines "a great army of onward-marching adult faithful, prepared to enter this latest engagement in the gender wars" as indifferent teens stand by.[11]) But as Pollack remarks, "The fact that we're all sitting here together from very different kinds of backgrounds, some of us studying boys and some studying girls, and that we have ... a fair amount of agreement on ... central points is exactly the opposite of what the media has attempted to portray and what it has put forward."

Similarly, the balkanized view of both gender relations in school and gender research erases the substantial and provocative differences among feminist scholars especially, who—whether they study boys or girls—are caricatured by critics as a "monolithic feminism" in lockstep. In other words, if there is a gender war, it would be difficult to discern the sides, given shared interests among scholars of boys and girls and meaningful differences of opinion, interpretation, and conclusion among feminist scholars who focus on girls' and women's experiences.

Victims and Victors?

The gender war redounds on individual girls and boys by sorting them into tidy camps of winner/loser or victor/victim. Thorne characterizes this as an "either/or, seesaw" logic, whereby one sex invariably is down while the other is up: "So if girls aren't the victims, then boys must be the victims." This seesaw reasoning distorts the more plausible reality that both boys and girls as groups are simultaneously thriving in some areas of school life and struggling in others. Furthermore, children and youth in most cases are both victims and victors in their own lives; Garbarino's work reveals that boys who commit violent acts both victimize other people and are most often themselves victims of violence or other depredations. As legal theorist Joan Williams explains, discourse about gender tends to set up an opposition between "agency" and "constraint," the former glossing over the existence of power and the latter glossing over the agency and power that individuals exercise in their lives. What is required to understand gender dynamics, she argues, is "a language that captures both the

social constraints within which people operate and the scope of agency they exercise within those constraints."[12]

Other participants corrected the notion that feminism has depicted girls as hapless victims who are individually oppressed by boys and men or the seesaw counterpoint that boys are now the real victims in the face of a feminist and politically correct school culture that aims to feminize them and strip them of their true masculinity. Thorne objects to the "antifeminist backlash" that has thus "misrepresented feminism as if all feminists have done is portray girls as victims," a quite startling misrepresentation of a rich and varied body of feminist research. The feminized classroom, the argument goes, alienates boys as education's "real" losers and enshrines girls as the "real" winners. This logic holds that boys or girls occupy two (and only two) opposing, although alternating, roles vis-à-vis one another: victim or victor.

Barrie Thorne

Participants puzzled over depictions of masculinity and boyhood in popular discourse. On one hand boys materialize as toxic sources of disruption and danger—bullies who may victimize girls (and boys) by outbursts of bad, if not lethal, behavior. In other renditions that recount boys' higher diagnosis for special education and attention deficit disorder, lower reading scores, and higher dropout rates, boys appear as the enfeebled victims of girls or, more aptly, of feminism writ large, which has feminized the classroom and education.[13]

Participants concurred that these troubling educational developments and outcomes for boys, especially as they vary by race and ethnicity, merit further research and are as much a part of the gender equity puzzle as girls' outcomes. However, participants also underscored that in other crucial contexts and moments when boys' status and well-being should be discussed, issues of

masculinity become invisible. Kimmel, Garbarino, and Thorne noted that boys commit the overwhelming majority of school shootings, yet the media rarely discuss issues of masculinity or gender when framing these stories. "When I think of the way the media understands gender, they think about women as having gender," Kimmel surmises. "But when we talk about boys, we don't talk about masculinity. ... We talk about school violence or teen violence without gendering it. But if all those school shooters were poor black girls in Newark or Philadelphia, you'd better believe we'd be having a national discussion about race, class, and gender. ... In some ways ... when it counts, masculinity is invisible."

In a similar vein, many participants, including Pollack, noted that homophobia —the bullying of boys by other boys, primarily as "sissies" or "fags"— profoundly affects boys' school lives and reinforces gender norms yet remains largely invisible in discussions of gender and education. Kimmel shares that in his analysis of masculinity "the central dynamic is not domination over women, it's homophobia, it's fear of other men. ... That fear is ... a dominant fear, the fear that people will see you as a sissy or weak." Indeed, an overwhelming majority (86 percent) of both boys and girls reported in a 1993 national survey that they would be very upset if they were called gay or lesbian in school. No other type of harassment—including actual physical abuse—provoked such a strong reaction among boys.[14]

The invisibility of masculinity coupled with the recent visibility of boys as education's victims have generated a partial and conflicted discussion of gender and schooling over the past few years. Our culture's blind spot for discussions of masculinity may stem, in part, from a tendency to see gender as solely the "property of individuals," as Kimmel explains, in which boys and girls or men and women as individuals—victims or villains—are assumed to be acting upon one another. (Hence the criticism that research on girls and education unfairly indicted teachers and men as oppressive villains when the bulk of the research pointed instead to subtle, unconscious, and reflexive classroom habits— practiced by both men and women—that might unwittingly affect girls' learning.) Yet as Kimmel clarifies, gender "emerges in our interactions, and it is something that is structured and embedded in the institutions we inhabit, in the spatial arrangements, in the rules of conduct." In that sense, gender bias may have no individual perpetrator or villain but may nevertheless have significant influence over how individuals interact and think of themselves. Gender

expectations and assumptions are often reproduced reflexively, without intent by men, women, girls, or boys to do so, and certainly without intent to victimize one sex on behalf of another.

Questions of Nature or Nurture

The phrase gender war assumes—in tone when not explicitly in content—that males and females occupy relatively fixed positions, established through biological difference, that validate a description of them as opposite sexes with distinct dispositions and characters. For example, an October 2000 *Psychology Today* headline proclaims, "The New Gender Wars: It's Boys Against Girls Yet Again." The origins of observed sex differences, however frequent or rare, have intrigued each generation of parents, educators, and researchers, and the nature-or-nurture debate has regularly surfaced over the last decades in the popular media and for several centuries in political theory and evolutionary thought.[15] Such a debate is unlikely to have a definitive resolution. Cutting-edge neurological research finds that the interaction between hardwiring and environment is so complex as to defy simple cause-and-effect explanations for behaviors. Rather than resolving the issue through the mapping of a gene for, say, a tendency to enjoy violent video games or to play with Barbie dolls, advances in genetics have revealed that multiple factors contribute to many physical afflictions or predispositions, to say nothing of less tangible traits such as personality, preferences, or behavior.

In their daily interactions with children, parents and educators perceive differences among boys and girls (and far more striking hardwired individual differences among siblings and students) that seem to develop even in the absence of any overt gender stereotyping by adults (and sometimes in spite of efforts to expose children to all possible options). "When you talk to parents," Bailey recalls, "they'll tell you, 'Oh, it's really true. Girls really are more this way, and boys are more that way.' And I don't want to be in a position of denying what they feel is their real experience, but rather acknowledging it and offering a reason why that might be the case, but also arguing that it doesn't necessarily have to be the case." Several pieces of research have considered the ways that, as philosopher Martha Nussbaum summarizes, "gender differences replicate themselves across generations" through parenting, schooling, and other intimate relationships such that "what is artificial can nonetheless be nearly ubiquitous" in our lives and daily experiences.[16] In other words, we may take some differ-

> I can think of no trait whatsoever that only boys categorically have and girls don't or that girls categorically have and boys don't. What we know is that girls as well as boys are hardwired to be competent, creative, and competitive. What we know is that boys as well as girls are hardwired to be caring, nurturing, and compassionate. The question is not whether or not we are hardwired. I agree that there are hardwired traits. The question is which ones we value and nurture in which gender that makes these relatively related people seem so different.
>
> —MICHAEL KIMMEL

ences to be natural because they are reproduced subtly and across so many relations and interactions that they no longer reveal the traces of social practices, choices, or norms.

Pollack articulated several participants' view that nature plays some role in shaping identity. "Anyone who would say that there's no such thing as nature, of course, would be silly, and some of us have been posed in that kind of way. Boys and girls do have some differences," he clarifies. Participants' own cumulative research and the larger body of literature, however, point to the powerful effects of environment, parenting, schooling, and a host of social and cultural factors in shaping boys' and girls' sense of identity. "The potency of parenting and the potency of the context of our society is 10 times more powerful in shaping the way boys and girls learn and the way boys and girls are than biology," Pollack asserts.

Participants pointed to cross-cultural comparisons and historical changes in gender identity as compelling evidence that these identities are quite mutable—concepts that are defined and then enacted in context—rather than natural or inherent outgrowths of biological difference. "Cultural practices create ideas like the *opposite* sexes or that girls and boys are innately different. You have only to look at the cross-cultural and historical records to see what incredible variation there is in conceptions of masculinity, femininity, or, indeed, whether or not gender is deeply salient at all," Thorne summarizes. In their own

research some participants have found that gender identity is enacted and negotiated by individuals on a daily basis. Phillips explains her own interest in "how people think about gender ... and how they conceptualize and navigate among the competing discourses about what it means to be a good woman, what it means to be a good man. ... I'm particularly interested in how young women navigate within this bombardment of competing messages about what it means to be a good woman" of a particular class, race, culture, and community.

Participants commented that we are attuned to noting sex differences yet take little conscious notice of the areas of overlap in boys' and girls' behaviors. When the two are compared, it is most often to draw a contrast rather than to note a similarity, although similarities are indeed more common.

"Boys Will Be Boys" and "Girls Will Be Girls"

Significantly, people tend to assert that "boys will be boys" or "girls will be girls" only in moments when boys' or girls' behavior matches a traditional stereotype about masculinity and femininity—for example, when a boy roughhouses or a girl plays with dolls. People rarely invoke the phrase in response to the myriad and most typical moments when girls or boys act more alike than dissimilar in their basic human qualities or when boys or girls behave in ways that transgress a narrow cliché about their gender. For example, when boys care for or console their friends, express emotions or feelings of sadness, or enjoy reading, or when girls are competitive, physical, and aggressive with one another, observers rarely comment that boys will be boys or girls will be girls. Yet these behaviors are as much—in fact, much more—a part of boys' and girls' daily repertoire of behaviors and are thus as much a part of real masculinity and femininity as stereotypical traits. Thus, boys will be boys should apply equally to moments when boys express feelings and cooperate, and girls will be girls should apply equally to moments when girls compete and play aggressively. Why are these moments any less an authentic part of masculine or feminine identity than stereotypical traits?

Indeed, participants objected that the assumption of natural sex differences does not reflect what boys and girls as complex individuals yearn for and articulate. "The only people who are worried about us feminizing boys," argues Pollack, "are people who aren't boys, because when you interview boys, which no one who says we're feminizing boys has done ... the boys [don't] say it. ... If you listen to what the boys say, the boys say that they feel penned in and

straitjacketed, [that] they'd like to have more of a range of how they can express themselves, that it shouldn't have to be uncool to be smart, and [that] it shouldn't be just one way to be a guy. ... [They say,] 'We want a school environment that can help support [us] that so we don't get made fun of every time we try to be who we are.'"

"Boys Will *Be Boys" or "Boys* Should *Be Boys"?*

With regard to the assertion that natural behavioral differences between the sexes distort the inclinations of children and exaggerate gender differences that pale in comparison to similarities and differences among individuals, some participants commented that it is a didactic or prescriptive rather than a descriptive stance. They note that "boys will be boys" or "girls will be girls" might more aptly be rephrased as "boys *should* be boys" and "girls *should* be girls."

Gender ideologies are harmful to boys and girls. [Ideologies] keep [boys and girls] locked into roles and induce us as adults to create certain kinds of educational opportunities for some and to block off other kinds of opportunities and visions for others, rather than to open people up to a full range of possibilities, regardless of the gender, regardless of their background.

—SUSAN BAILEY

Not only are gender prescriptions and ideologies not "natural," some participants further asserted, but they may also thwart girls' and boys' development in school and outside. Bailey described ongoing research on gender ideologies by Deborah Tolman and others at the Wellesley Centers for Research on Women who are studying what individuals think it means to be a boy or a girl and how boys and girls should behave. According to Bailey, Tolman and her colleagues have found: "For both boys and girls, the more traditional their assumptions about what it means to be and how you should behave as a boy or a girl, the [higher the] rates of depression. For girls, adolescent pregnancy tends to be higher, and for boys, belief in coercive behavior in relationship with girls is higher. ... Holding these very traditional stereotypes about yourself as boy or girl is not healthy."

Kimmel challenges, "If masculinity were so natural, we wouldn't have to enforce it every second" through teasing, bullying, and incessant judgments and declarations about what constitutes normal male or female behavior. Pollack calls for a plurality and "diversity [of views] of what it means to be a real boy" and questions why we would opt to straitjacket boys or girls by making assumptions about who they are instead of expanding their options and roles in life. Phillips recommends that to some extent, adults need to "get out of [boys' and girls'] way and let them explore [gender issues] themselves."

The More Things Change?

Garbarino elaborates a central fallacy in the sociobiological argument that biological differences are immutable and cultural differences are easily transformed: "There's an assumption that if you say it's nurture or culture, you're saying automatically that it's malleable, whereas if you say it's nature or biology, you're saying it's not malleable, it's not changeable. But in fact ... there are many biological things that have shown themselves to be much more subject to change than many cultural things. ... The eradication of smallpox was child's play compared with the eradication of child abuse."

James Garbarino

The Nature/Nurture Question Revisited

Ultimately, participants remarked that the nature-or-nurture debate is something of a red herring. Notwithstanding the complex interplay of nature, culture, social norms, and disposition that shape identity, schools, parents, and other adults still have a responsibility to help children think about and navigate gender identity so that they feel they have genuine options in their lives. As Phillips summarizes the group's discussion: "Whether some [group] might tend inherently toward one characteristic or another—first of all, I don't think it's the case. Second of all, if it is the case, it seems it's our responsibility as educators, as researchers, as parents, as community members, to try to open up options for young people. So the context is something we can get our arms around, and we have a responsibility to do something about." Kimmel feels, similarly, that "the four most

depressing words I've heard in educational policy circles these days is 'boys will be boys.'"

Fighting the Last War

Kimmel concluded that the war metaphor demonstrates a certain historical amnesia toward cyclic, recurring concerns about masculinity and the feminization of boys in U.S. culture. (Scholar Jordan Titus has analogized current consternation about boys' educational achievement and their masculinity to a "moral panic" akin to earlier 20th-century social concerns[17]). According to Kimmel: "Much of my work has been on the excavation of the idea of masculinity since 1776. In the early years of the 20th century, there was a massive debate that replicates exactly the kind of debates that we're having now, and this was, of course, another era in which women had made enormous strides and were demanding entry into the public sphere. The very boys for whom such dire consequences were predicted—they would become feminized, they would lose their manhood, et cetera—became what is now hailed as the greatest generation. And so I'd like us to remember a little bit about the outcomes of those past gender wars."

Part 4

What Are the Priorities? Setting an Agenda for the Future

Toward the end of their conversation, participants shared some priority issues for both boys and girls in the 21st century. The discussion began with the premise that although individuals will always differ (and thankfully so) in their preferences, abilities, and needs, differences between boys and girls as groups in how they perceive schooling, perform in certain areas, and experience school life are more a creation of how adults socialize children toward particular gender identities and less a natural crystallization of fixed biological differences between the sexes. The breath-taking and exciting pace of change in boys' and girls'—and men's and women's—identities over the last four decades alone attests to the profound influence of social and cultural factors in shaping individuals' preferences and sense of their potential. Participants agreed that we do not need to fix the boys or fix the girls; instead, we need to fix the institutions, communities, schools, practices, and expectations that limit both girls' and boys' sense of themselves, their options, or their ability to express themselves as full human beings across a variety of social roles.

Michael Kimmel and Lynn Phillips

As Hersch expounds, adults tend to describe both the problems and differences among boys and girls as located in children themselves, to questionable effect: "The problems have much more to do with the context of society than individual pathologies inherent in boys or girls. It's the context that is failing them and in a sense, they're the symptom bearers. ... It's filtering down to the boys and the girls in ways that are making them all feel like they have problems that are inherent to them that maybe aren't theirs. I would much rather see the work being done in homes, schools, and communities—at that level."

Enhancing Research

Encourage More Collaboration Among Researchers

Participants called for more events like the symposium, so primary researchers with expertise on both boys' and girls' issues can convene to share insights and synthesize their knowledge of how boys and girls fare in school. Although media and, to some extent, academics themselves tend to splinter according to which type of student the researcher studies or which strand of social identity most interests them, participants retorted that there has been and continues to be a great interdependency and complementarity between research that takes girls as its focal point and research that starts with boys' experiences. Participants conceded that it is difficult to truly understand gender without drawing on the experience of both sexes. "The time has come," Pollack recommends, "and the only way to really understand girls is to understand boys, and the only way to really understand boys is to understand girls."

Since research on boys or girls is not complete without an analysis of differences by race/ethnicity, class, and other variables, we must develop further collaborative enterprises among scholars who investigate each and all dimensions of social equity in schooling. Too often, as Thorne noted, a researcher's intellectual awareness of the multi-faceted nature of students' identities gives way in practice to a more simplified analysis that focuses only on race or ethnicity to the exclusion of gender or only on gender to the exclusion of class. In some studies "framed in terms of race and class," Thorne observes, "the gender strand just ... fades away," even when the researchers are aware of and interested in gender issues. In other studies that focus on gender, the converse is true.

Phillips calls for "more collaboration among researchers who focus on girls and [those] who focus on boys, ... among researchers who focus on very young children and those who focus on adolescents, and ... among researchers who focus inside schools and those whose focus is on outside-of-school contexts."

Disaggregate Data

Participants underscored the growing importance of disaggregating achievement and other educational data (national, state, and local) by sex and race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and other variables. Availability of data that describe student achievement and outcomes according to all these factors will only become more imperative as the country increases its reliance on standardized

tests as measures of school and student performance and as the country becomes more demographically diverse. Given the strong interplay between race, ethnicity, gender, and class, data that describe achievement only by gender, race, or ethnicity will most likely mask or hide crucial differences among boys and girls along these lines or hide differences by gender. "It's a very positive thing when you see states requiring that the data be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and other characteristics in order to claim effectiveness among schools," says Clewell. "Schools have to show that their standardized test scores are producing equal outcomes for students of different races, ethnicities, sex, and so on."

Listening to Girls and Boys and Building on Their Strengths

Participants' cumulative research flags some key issues for boys and girls. Among other issues, boys receive attention deficit disorder diagnoses far more frequently than girls and are more likely to be placed in special education programs; sex segregation persists in students' selection of courses and career paths; and a climate of disrespect, violence, and harassment among peers in some schools makes learning difficult for girls and boys alike, although the climate sometimes is not identified as an issue related to gender. Participants generalized that some of these problems emerge from an inability to recognize symptoms in boys or girls or to be responsive to their needs, limited efforts to genuinely talk with and listen to adolescents (as Hersch's work demonstrates), and missed opportunities to cultivate the strengths and skills that adolescents already possess.

Listen to Girls and Boys

Several participants criticized the familiar media depiction of adolescents as stock figures or clichés, as statistical norms and patterns without human voice, as collections of pathologies and risks, as menacing and potentially explosive threats, or as "a tribe apart," in Hersch's metaphor—a group alien and distant from adult communities. Although adults fret about and abstractly discuss adolescents, participants expressed concern that those same adults rarely get to listen to or hear what children and adolescents themselves have to say. "I don't think we know nearly enough about what boys and girls think about their own lives and think about what they need," Phillips worries. "In hundreds of interviews with girls ... one of the questions I asked them is, 'If you could set adults straight about girls' experiences, [if] you could just have the floor and tell them

anything you want to, what would you say?' For all the differences among all the girls that I've spoken with ... I can probably count on one hand the number of girls who did *not* say, 'Listen to girls.' I'm sure if I were interviewing boys, they would say, 'Please listen to boys. Give us a chance to speak for ourselves. You think you know so much about who we are and what we need.' Sometimes we get it right, [but] a lot of times, there's a lot missing."

> **We do need to be alert to the context and how it changes and our ability as adults to both listen to the kids and to use our adult influence to change the parameters of that context so that [girls and boys] can grow and thrive.**
>
> —PATRICIA HERSCH

Pollack agrees, noting that in his own research he sees that "boys want adults who will listen to what they have to say, and so often, they don't find that. They find a preconceived notion of who they are ... and they're turned directly off."

Recognize and Cultivate Boys' and Girls' Strengths

Indeed, some participants stressed that not only should we listen more intently, seriously, and openly to boys' and girls' voices and needs, but we should also involve them as stakeholders in their own lives and build upon their many strengths and resiliencies rather than their often-discussed pathologies. For example, Phillips recommends that agencies in community settings consider having girls or boys on their boards and "putting [children] in a position where they have voice and expertise and authority and where they can teach adults."

Contrary to the popular conception of adolescence, Hersch's qualitative research of an adolescent community in suburban Virginia "pointed to great strengths in the adolescent community out of our sight, where boys and girls together have essentially taken on the roles of raising and nurturing each other in ways that are caring and supportive. ... There are huge chunks of time where boys and girls together are being very caring with one another. And that is very hopeful."

Participants lamented the dearth of stories from those Kimmel and Pollack identify as resisters. "What are the stories of those [boys] who can negotiate a path to a secure, healthy manhood? What do they tell us about what those obstacles

are and how to address them?" Phillips echoes. "We need more research, more media reporting, and so forth, about what's going right, in what ways girls are thriving, in what way boys are thriving, and about what our responsibilities are to make sure that happens more."

Help Girls and Boys Talk Together

Girls and boys experience gender identity conflicts daily in their school lives and consciously or unconsciously experiment with gender meanings, yet participants observed that students rarely have programs and places where they can talk openly and critically about gender with one another. Several participants recommended that adults create opportunities for boys and girls themselves to discuss gender identity in school and elsewhere and expressed confidence that boys and girls could resolve some of their own conflicts through this sort of exchange. The negotiation of gender identity is a major element of boys' and girls' lives in school and outside, yet it is more often available for analysis by adults than boys and girls. This is a lost opportunity for insight and change, since, as Thorne notes, "Kids are capable of quite engaged and passionate discussions about issues of gender." Bailey agrees, commenting that "One of the things we need to do more explicitly is to talk about these issues with students—girls and boys—because when you can talk about gender [and] when you can talk about the power issues, you can talk about race and class and have a discussion about it. It isn't invisible" anymore.

> My sardonic joke is that for 12 years we inculcate gender in school systems without talking about it, and then if you make it to college, you can specialize in it and talk about it. But we should be starting to talk about it in kindergarten. ... By fourth grade, [kids] don't have their armor up yet, and they are just raring to go.
>
> —William Pollack

Cultivate and Support Boy-Girl Friendships

Notwithstanding exaggerated accounts of irreconcilable differences in attitude and style between the "warring" sexes, research by participants points to a

desire and capacity among girls and boys to build strong, sustaining relations with one another. Some participants pointed to these friendships as a crucial source of resiliency and change in gender relations and suggested that communities and schools should encourage such friendships. "One of the things that I found that was very reassuring [and] that I don't think is well known in the adult world," shares Hersch, "is that boy and girl adolescents really do have the capability to have wonderful friendships [with] each other. Adolescents have mastered the multicultural friendships and between-the-sexes friendships in a way that certainly my generation didn't do very well. That's quite remarkable, and it's widespread ... and it's a very positive thing."

Susan Bailey

Boys and girls who seek and maintain friendships with one another sometimes do so despite obstacles such as the tendency, as Pollack describes, for adults and the media to "sexualize" boy-girl friendships at increasingly young ages. Pollack elaborates: "What boys say at least is that they want to be friends with girls and, in fact, are friends with girls, but there's an interesting factor that gets in [boys'] way [in] talking about it, and that's ... adults. When boys, especially when they become adolescents, want to be friendly with girls, we adults tend to sexualize [the friendship] and see it in a sexualized or dangerous fashion, and [boys] feel they need to hide it. The girls, in fact, verify this."

According to Thorne: "Adults can intervene to promote the moments of relation and cooperation, brotherly [and] sisterly, and you can see that in some schools and classrooms. So right on the ground, there are interventions that can be made that implement [these] ideals." On the elementary school level, for example, Thorne recommends "challenging the kind of gender separa[tion] of girls against the boys. Some teaching practices feed that, but there are lots of

creative practices that lessen that and that promote cooperation and friendship between girls and boys."

> ***Campbell:*** **My favorite example is the boy ... who moved from girls who use tools shouldn't —they should cook and clean to girls who use tools can sometimes be your friends.**
>
> ***Pollack:*** **And the same thing can happen the other way, from girls feeling that all boys are sexual predators and I have to give my body to them to, gee, there's some boys who want to be my friend in this class.**
>
> —PAT CAMPBELL AND WILLIAM POLLACK

Rebuild Adult-Adolescent Communities

Many boys and girls, especially as they reach adolescence, lack consistent and meaningful connections to other adults, either with their parents, who, as Hersch's work shows, tend to withdraw from adolescents as an "undifferentiated mob," or from other adults in schools and communities. This problem cuts across gender differences yet has deleterious effects on boys' and girls' abilities to navigate gender identity and especially on their struggles around sex or sexuality and their conceptualization of family roles. "A lot of the young people are starved for a lot of the same things," says Hersch. "Boys and girls who came to my house to be interviewed for the book would stand outside my office and look at the family pictures on the wall and want to know the stories, the family stories. ... It's not that [these kids] didn't have folks at home, but they were just starved for the ... stories of how you 'do' family and the kinds of things that used to normally just be passed in everyday conversation. ... It's just that their lives were so devoid of any contact with adults, because when you're an adolescent ... you catch adults on the fly."

Some participants added that dwindling public spaces and resources for children in the community exacerbate the cultural alienation or disconnect between adults and the adolescent subculture. Participants underscored that a diminished commitment to public school funding will redound negatively on all children. Thorne lamented the unraveling of the formerly esteemed parks and

recreation program in Oakland, California, over the last three decades and of neighborhoods and civic infrastructures such as the Camp Fire Boys and Girls, Boy Scouts of America, and other institutions that linked boys and girls to their communities, neighborhoods, and adults. While affluent children's activities are increasingly organized "almost entirely through shopping, whether it's schools, nannies, or lessons," says Thorne, the "lives of lower-income kids are organized through public institutions and resources that are in short supply and through networks of family and friends." Thorne decries the "commercialization of childhood" itself—the treatment of children and adolescents as potential and actual consumers for goods marketed to them. Hersch affirms that in her research on suburban adolescence she found that "kids feel as if they're commodities" for adults.

The dissolution of civic structures to support both boys and girls strains families and further distances children's communities from those of adults. Raising boys and girls effectively, participants affirmed, requires a renewed commitment to intensive and thoughtful interaction between adults and adolescents not only by parents, but by communities and schools as well.

Improving the Classroom

Decades of research on teacher-student and gender dynamics in the classroom have yielded multiple strategies for effective and equitable teaching. Participants underscored that these insights must better inform classroom practices to ensure that both boys and girls get what they need. Participants also emphasized that teachers need to stay attuned to boys' and girls' progress and engagement in the classroom and be flexible enough to try different strategies to engage all students.

Adopt Multiple Learning Styles

As research on gender and education corroborates, educators must observe and respond to the behaviors and learning progress of boys and girls as groups and then fine-tune teaching styles and pedagogy to ensure that learning occurs for all. Some research has identified cooperative and collaborative learning as especially effective and conducive for female students in mathematics and science, while other research on boys has emphasized that some kinds of reading material or long periods of immobility may alienate boys from school. Participants emphasized that given the rich body of literature on effective teaching styles and

pedagogy, teachers should be equipped to use a variety of techniques to suit the particular dynamics of their classroom and to ensure equal engagement in learning by diverse boys and girls. "To make the classroom work for everyone," Campbell concludes from her research, "you need to have a whole parcel of strategies that you use—that you, as the teacher, are checking to see who's getting it under which strategies."

Clewell similarly places a priority on "instructional strategies that are effective for a diverse group of students [including] cooperative learning," which places an emphasis on group work and appeals to a broad range of students. Clewell stressed the importance of vigilance and keen observation by teachers in creating an equitable and effective classroom. "If you're a teacher, and I was a teacher at one time," she recalls, "you do have a classroom with lots of different people, and they are all different faces and they have different cultures. And you teach to each one of them at some point. You make sure that they're learning. You look in their eyes and see whether they're learning or not. A good teacher will do that."

Invest in Teaching

Participants agreed that if we are concerned, as some are, about the "feminization" of the classroom or school environment generally and early childhood education specifically, we need to raise the status and prestige of teaching as a profession for women and men. As noted earlier, very few men pursue early childhood education, in large part because it lacks prestige, pay, and status—perhaps because, in a circular fashion, it is an overwhelmingly feminine (and hence "ghettoized") field. Participants noted that we need to raise the status of teaching, particularly if we hope to attract both men and women to the elementary school classroom. Bailey and others commented that early childhood education epitomizes the tendency to confer lower status and prestige on fields and skills historically dominated by women and higher prestige on those held primarily by men, a pattern we need to challenge before K-12 teaching can achieve a comparable status to higher education.

Create Truly Safe Schools and Enforce a Respectful Classroom Environment

What produces a safe school and classroom for boys and girls? Recent episodes of school shootings have inspired calls for tougher security at schools, yet participants, especially Garbarino and Pollack, criticized this response as shortsighted and belated. "We're spending approximately $20 million on so-called

school safety ... which is controlling [kids'] dangerous, supposedly inherent behaviors," Pollack asserts. "But we already know from some of the research that we've done that the most safe schools are schools in which boys and girls can interact positively together, respect each other, and talk to each other ... so why aren't we doing that? That wouldn't be a zero-sum game; that would be a plus-plus game."

"There are a lot of activities and a lot of things that you can do in a classroom that really make it work for both girls and boys," Campbell adds. "One of the basic rules is no disrespect. The students are not allowed to disrespect each other. They are not allowed to disrespect the teacher and the teacher does not disrespect the students. Teachers have lots of strategies ... but it's key that it's really clear to everybody in the classroom that [disrespect] is not allowed, and if it happens, it will be punished."

Summing Up

By generously sharing their insights, expertise, and wisdom, participants in the AAUW Educational Foundation's "Beyond the 'Gender Wars'" symposium have mapped areas for future research and illustrated more accurate, sophisticated, and constructive ways to approach questions of gender equity and identity, both within school and without. Their perspectives, which draw on decades of cumulative original research, share a commitment to viewing gender as an analytic category that affects how institutions are structured as well as how individuals—boys and girls, women and men—perceive themselves and interact. Rather than focusing on girls or boys as warring groups where the gains of one come at the expense of the other, these researchers urge us to understand the interdependency of boys' and girls' experiences in school and to recognize heterogeneity (by race, ethnicity, class, region, and sexuality, among other variables) within these groups. Schools are influential settings for the transmission of cultural values and the development of students' interests, ambitions, and identity. Ultimately, successful and equitable schools will encourage equal academic achievement and engagement for boys and girls across the curriculum and will also equip them to live and work together in an increasingly diverse society.

Endnotes

[1] Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982).

[2] Christina Hoff Sommers, *Who Stole Feminism?* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994) and *The War Against Boys* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000).

[3] In "Gender Wars Redux," *U.S. News & World Report* 127, no. 6 (February 22, 1999), John Leo exemplifies zero-sum thinking in his conclusion that the "educational status of boys, not girls, is the real problem. ... If we put ideology aside, which gender do we think needs help now?" Similarly in "While Boosting Girls, Educational System Holds Boys Back," *Arizona Republic* (December 9, 1998), columnist Kathleen Parker illustrates the either/or logic that girls gain only at boys' expense: "For many boys school has been a punishment, where boy behavior was pathologized and girl behavior was sanctified. In our noble attempt to elevate girls and women, we've denigrated boys and men."

[4] In *Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America* (Washington, DC: 1991) AAUW noted differences by race and sex in self-esteem.

[5] See the American Council on Education, *Gender Equity in Higher Education: Are Male Students at a Disadvantage?* (Washington, DC: 2000) on the interaction of race, class, and gender in college enrollment.

[6] Kimmel refers here to Signithia Fordham, *Blacked Out: Dilemmas of Race, Identity, and Success at Capital High* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996). See especially pages 248, 250, 287, and 329-30.

[7] On computer clubs, see Janet Ward Schofield, *Computers and Classroom Culture* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), and AAUW Educational Foundation, *Tech-Savvy: Educating Girls in the New Computer Age* (Washington, DC: 2000).

[8] On masculinity and the curriculum, for example, see Rob Gilbert and Pamela Gilbert, *Masculinity Goes to School* (London: Routledge, 1998).

[9] AAUW Educational Foundation, *Hostile Hallways: The AAUW Survey on Sexual Harassment in America's Schools* (Washington, DC: 1993), 19-20.

[10] See articles by Claude Steele, including "A Threat in the Air: How Stereotypes Shape Intellectual Identity and Performance," *American Psychologist* 52, no. 6 (1997): 613-29; "Stereotype Threat and the Intellectual Test Performance of African Americans," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69 (1995): 797-811; and "Race and the Schooling of Black Americans," *Atlantic Monthly* (April 1992): 68-78.

[11] Nicholas Lemann, "The Battle Over Boys," *New Yorker* (July 10, 2000): 79-83.

[12] Joan Williams, *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What to Do About It* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 38.

[13] Sommers, *The War Against Boys*.

[14] AAUW Educational Foundation, *Hostile Hallways*, p. 20.

[15] Barrie Thorne, *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1993).

[16] Martha Nussbaum, "The Professor of Parody," *The New Republic* (February 22, 1999): 37-45. Nussbaum is summarizing work by scholar Nancy Chodorow on "the reproduction of mothering."

[17] Jordan Titus, *Boy Trouble: Underachievement, Moral Panic, and the Social Order*, paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, New Orleans, LA, April 2000.

Biographies of Participants

Susan McGee Bailey, Ph.D., is the executive director of the Wellesley Centers for Women (the Center for Research on Women and the Stone Center) at Wellesley College, where she is also professor of women's studies and education. She has a bachelor's degree from Wellesley College and a master's degree and doctorate in social science educational research from the University of Michigan. She held a postdoctoral fellowship in public health from Johns Hopkins University. Before joining the Wellesley Center for Research on Women in 1986, Bailey directed the Resource Center on Educational Equity at the Council of Chief State School Officers in Washington, D.C., and the Policy Research Office on Women's Education at Harvard and Radcliffe and held various posts at the Connecticut State Educational Agency.

Bailey taught elementary and secondary school in the United States, Asia, and Latin America. She is past president of the board of the National Council for Research on Women and has written and lectured extensively on issues of gender equity in education. She was the principal author of *How Schools Shortchange Girls: The AAUW Report* (1992) and has directed several projects focused on improving opportunities for women and girls in science and mathematics. Following the nongovernmental organization forum at the U.N. Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, China, she co-authored a guide for junior and senior high school teachers, *Shaping a Better World: Global Issues/Gender Issues*. Her current work focuses on gender-equitable education in the context of the global struggle for human rights and democratic governments.

Patricia B. Campbell, Ph.D., is the president of Campbell-Kibler Associates, an educational research and evaluation firm. Formerly an associate professor of research, measurement, and statistics at Georgia State University, Campbell has authored more than 90 publications including books, book chapters, and articles, and has served as an editor (most recently as research news and comment editor of *Educational Researcher*). Her diverse professional activities have ranged from conducting training in educational evaluation and research in South Africa and Uganda to serving as an expert witness in the sex discrimination case brought against the Citadel to acting as a frequent consultant to the National Science Foundation. Her awards include the American Educational Research Association Willystine Goodsell Award, the Women in Engineering Program Advocates Network Betty Vetter Award, the Educational Press Association of America Distinguished Achievement Award for Excellence in Educational Journalism, and the EDPRESS Merit Award: Series. Other honors include being named lieutenant colonel, aide-de-camp, Georgia governor's staff.

Campbell co-authored the following recent publications: *Saving Babies and the Future of SMET in America* (1999) (with Lesli Hoey), a paper commissioned by the U.S. congressional Commission on the Advancement of Women and Minorities in Science, Engineering, and Technology Development; "Science, Math and Girls ... Still a Long Way to Go," *Education Week* 19, no. 2 (September 15, 1999): 50, 53 (with Beatriz Chu Clewell); "Of Two Minds: Single-Sex Education, Coeducation, and the Search for Gender Equity in K-12 Public Schooling," *New York Law School Journal of Human Rights* 14, pt. 1 (1998) (with Ellen Wahl); and "What's Sex Got to Do With It? Simplistic Questions, Complex Answers," in *Separated by Sex: A Critical Look at Single-Sex Education for Girls* (1998), 63-73 (with Ellen Wahl).

Beatriz Chu Clewell, Ph.D., is a principal research associate and director of evaluation studies and equity research at the Education Policy Center of the Urban Institute in Washington, D.C. Previously, she was a senior research scientist for 12 years at the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey. Clewell is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Florida State University, where she also obtained her doctorate in educational policy, planning, and analysis in 1980. In 1992 she received the Distinguished Scholar Award from the American Educational Research Association.

Clewell has spent nearly 20 years conducting research on the access of underrepresented people (specifically racial/ethnic minorities and women) to science, mathematics, and engineering fields. Much of her early research in this area is set forth in *Breaking the Barriers: Helping Female and Minority Students Succeed in Mathematics and Science* (1992). In 2000 she was principal investigator for the evaluation of the National Science Foundation's Program for Women and Girls. For the past seven months she has served as the executive director of the U.S. congressional Commission on the Advancement of Women and Minorities in Science, Engineering, and Technology Development based at the National Science Foundation.

James Garbarino, Ph.D., is co-director of the Family Life Development Center and Elizabeth Lee Vincent Professor of Human Development at Cornell University. From 1985 to 1994 he served as president of the Erikson Institute for Advanced Study in Child Development. He earned his bachelor's degree from St. Lawrence University in 1968 and his doctorate in human development and family studies from Cornell University in 1973. He is a fellow of the American Psychological Association.

Garbarino has served as consultant and adviser to a wide range of organizations, including the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse, the National Institute for Mental Health, the American Medical Association, the National Black Child Development Institute, the National Science Foundation, the National Resource Center for Children in Poverty, the Childwatch International Research Network, and the U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect. In 1991 he undertook missions for UNICEF to assess the impact of the Gulf War upon children in Kuwait and Iraq. He also consulted for programs serving Bosnian and Croatian children.

Garbarino has authored or edited many books, including the following: *Lost Boys: Why Our Sons Turn Violent and How We Can Save Them* (1999); *Raising Children in a Socially Toxic Environment* (1995); *Let's Talk About Living in a World With Violence* (1993); *Children in Danger: Coping With the Consequences of Community Violence* (1992); *Towards a Sustainable Society: An Economic, Social, and Environmental Agenda for Our Children's Future* (1992); *Children and Families in the Social Environment* (2d ed., 1992); *Saving Children: A Guide to Injury Prevention* (1991); *What Children Can Tell Us* (1989); *No Place to Be a Child: Growing Up in a War Zone* (1991); *Special Children/Special Risks: The Maltreatment of Children With Disabilities* (1987); *The Psychologically Battered Child* (1986); *Troubled Youth, Troubled Families* (1986); *Adolescent Development: An Ecological Perspective* (1985); *Social Support Networks* (1983); *Successful Schools and Competent Students* (1981); *Understanding Abusive Families* (1980; 2d ed., 1997); and *Protecting Children From Abuse and Neglect* (1980).

Garbarino serves as a consultant to television, magazine, and newspaper reports on children and families, and in 1981 he received the Silver Award at the International Film and Television Festival of New York for co-authoring *Don't Get Stuck There: A Film on Adolescent Abuse.* In 1985 he collaborated with John Merrow to produce *Assault on the Psyche*, a videotaped program dealing with psychological abuse. He also serves as a scientific expert witness in criminal and civil cases involving violence and children.

Garbarino has received the following honors and awards: honorary doctor of humane letters, St. Lawrence University (1995); Nicholas Hobbs Award, American Psychological Association Division on Child, Youth, and Family Services (1994); Dale Richmond Award, American Academy of Pediatrics Section on Behavioral and Developmental Pediatrics (1994); Brandt F. Steele Award, Kempe National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (1993); prize for research on child abuse, Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues (1993); Distinguished Professional Contributions to Public Service Award, American Psychological Association (1989); Vincent De Francis Award for nationally significant contributions to child protection, American Humane Association (1988); president, American Psychological Association Division on Child, Youth, and Family Services (1987); C. Henry Kempe Award, National Conference on Child Abuse and Neglect (1985); national fellow, Kellogg Foundation (1981); Mitchell Prize, Woodlands Conference on Sustainable Societies (1979 and 1981); and Spencer fellow, National Academy of Education (1975).

Patricia Hersch spent more than three years immersing herself in the adolescent culture of suburban Virginia to write *A Tribe Apart: A Journey Into the Heart of American Adolescence* (1999). Her account of "regular" adolescence in the 1990s touched a responsive chord nationally. Her book is the first ethnographic study from the home front, and her description of an "adolescent community" rings true with both children and adults. A former contributing editor to *Psychology Today*, Hersch has been published in *The Washington Post, USA Today, Newsday, The Chicago Sun-Times, McCall's, Family Therapy Networker, The Baltimore Sun*, and other newspapers and magazines. She was editor of the *Women in Development* newsletter for the United Nations and conducted an ethnographic study of homeless adolescents in San Francisco and New York for the National Institute of Drug Abuse and the Georgetown University Child Development Center. Since the publication of her book, Hersch has been in great demand as a lecturer on the topic of adolescence.

Hersch completed her undergraduate work at Oberlin College and her graduate work at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies.

Michael S. Kimmel, Ph.D., is a sociologist and author who has received international recognition for his work on men and masculinity. He is a professor at State University of New York-Stony Brook, and his innovative "Sociology of Masculinity" course, one of the few in the nation that examines men's lives from a pro-feminist perspective, has been featured in newspaper and magazine articles and on television shows. He is the editor of *Men and Masculinities*, an international, interdisciplinary journal that explores the roles and perceptions of men across society. Kimmel was a contributing editor at *Psychology Today* and served as an expert witness for the U.S. Department of Justice in the Virginia Military Institute and Citadel cases.

Kimmel's works include *The Gendered Society* (2000), *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (1996), *Men Confront Pornography* (1990), *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity* (1987), and *Against the Tide: Pro-Feminist Men in the United States, 1776-1990* (1992), a documentary history of men who supported women's equality since the founding of the country. He co-edited the college textbook *Men's Lives* (5th ed., forthcoming), which has been adopted in virtually every course on men and masculinity in the country. *The Politics of Manhood* (1996), which he edited, develops a debate and dialogue between pro-feminist men and the mythopoetic men's movement, which is best known through the work of Robert Bly. Bly and Kimmel have begun a series of public debates and dialogues about the politics of men's movements.

Lynn Phillips is a social and developmental psychologist at Eugene Lang College of the New School University in New York City. Her areas of expertise include violence and victimization, women's sexuality and relationships, and adolescent girls' development and education in and outside of schools.

Her book *Flirting With Danger: Young Women's Reflections on Sexuality and Domination* (2000) examines how young women conceptualize and negotiate the lines between "normal" heterosexual relationships and "victimization." Other recent publications include *The Girls Report: What We Know and Need to Know About Growing Up Female* (1998), a synthesis of more than 200 research and policy reports; discussions with researchers, educators, policy-makers, benefactors, and advocates; and interviews with adolescent girls; and *Unequal Partners: Exploring Power and Consent in Adult-Teen Relationships* (1997), a study of how males and females across various communities perceive and experience relationships between adult men and teen girls.

Phillips is research director of a two-year research initiative commissioned by the Girl's Best Friend Foundation in Chicago. The initiative was designed to explore the diverse needs and experiences of 12- through 18-year-old girls in Illinois. Using qualitative and quantitative methods and taking an "assets-based" approach, the study positions girls as researchers of their own and others' lives as they gather information about the availability of community resources to support the well-being of adolescent girls in urban, suburban, and rural settings.

As part of Chabot Observatory and Science Center's "Techbridge Program" in Oakland, California, Phillips is also directing a three-year, qualitative study to explore how gender and culture influence girls' access to and experiences with technology. The study is supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation.

William S. Pollack, Ph.D., is the director of the Center for Men and Young Men and the director of continuing education (psychology) at McLean Hospital. He is also assistant clinical professor of psychology in the Department of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical School. He is the past president of the Massachusetts Psychological Association, a member the Boston Psychoanalytic Society, a diplomate in clinical psychology (ABPP, board certified), and a founding member and fellow of the Society for the Psychological Study of Men and Masculinity, a division of the American Psychological Association. An internationally recognized authority on boys and men, Pollack is

founder and director of the REAL BOYS™ Educational Programs. He presently serves on the National Campaign Against Youth Violence, a presidential initiative.

His newest book, *Real Boys' Voices* (Random House, 2000), reveals the wide range of the "secret emotional lives" of young males in the United States—including their fears of violence and the scourge of bullying and the "boy code"; the impossible tests of masculinity; boys' yearning for "genuine relationships"; their struggles with their parents; and their sense of a hidden, but deeply rooted, spirituality—as told through their own stories in their own voices. Pollack offers advice on how to connect and listen to boys; recognize hidden signs of depression, suicide, and violence; and genuinely "bullyproof" our society. He identifies what he calls the "Columbine syndrome," which has made the United States afraid of its own sons and boys terrified by the so-called (and shortsighted and traumatic) "safety" measures we have attempted to implement to eradicate violence. His best-selling book *Real Boys: Rescuing Our Sons From the Myths of Boyhood* (1998) is based on his groundbreaking research project Listening to Boys' Voices, which focuses on the inner emotional experiences of boys and has had a profound impact on how we raise, teach, and relate to boys.

An expert in the areas of boys' development and education, men's roles (including violence, suicide, and depression), gender studies (men and boy-girl and male-female relationships), parenting (fathering), organizational structure, gender and balancing work and family, psychoanalytic psychotherapy, and professional issues in the practice of psychology, Pollack has written and contributed to numerous scholarly journal articles and book chapters. In addition, he is a nationally recognized speaker, and his work has been featured nationally and internationally in popular print and broadcast media, including *The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, USA Today, U.S. News & World Report, The Boston Globe, The London Sunday Independent, Seventeen, Glamour, Self, Ladies Home Journal, Longevity, Time, Newsweek, People, The Today Show,* National Public Radio, *Fresh Air*, British Broadcasting Corporation, *Frontline, 20/20, 48 Hours, Dateline, Prime Time Live, Good Morning America, Larry King Live*, and *The Oprah Winfrey Show.*

Barrie Thorne, Ph.D., is professor of sociology and women's studies at the University of California, Berkeley, where she also serves as co-director of the Center for Working Families. She is the U.S. editor of *Childhood: A Global Journal of Child Research*, incoming chair of the American Sociological Association Section on the Sociology of Children, past chair of the ASA Section on Sex and Gender, and former vice president of the ASA. Her trajectory as a sociologist has actively intersected with the movement to build women's studies as an interdisciplinary area of research and teaching. She has also been active in elevating the study of children and childhoods.

Thorne is the author of *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School* (Rutgers, 1993), an ethnography of gender relations in two elementary schools, and co-editor of *Feminist Sociology: Life Histories of a Movement* (1997), *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions* (2d ed., 1992), and *Language, Gender and Society* (1983). She has written journal articles and book chapters on children and gender, feminist challenges to and transformations of knowledge, feminist theories, gender and language, and women in the draft resistance movement of the 1960s.

In 1995 Thorne helped conceptualize and began work on "The California Childhoods Project," a collaborative research study focused on children's daily lives and the organization of childhoods in two communities (inner-city Los Angeles and Oakland) that vary in social class, racialized-ethnic composition, and patterns of immigration. Sponsored by the MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Successful Pathways Through Middle Childhood, the project has involved three years of team fieldwork in the public elementary school that anchors each geographic site, as well as in families, neighborhoods, parks, after-school programs, language schools, commercial places, and other contexts. Multilingual research teams have interviewed children, parents, teachers, and others who work with children in each community. Among other things, the study examines the shifting construction of and complex relations across boundaries—boundaries between schools, homes, neighborhoods, and other institutional contexts navigated by children ages 6 to 12; boundaries between different types of childhood (for example, those organized primarily through the market and those organized through extended kin and public institutions); and boundaries related to gender, racialized-ethnicity, social class, age, and other factors. Gender is one of many cross-cutting lines of socially constructed difference highlighted in this study. Attending to relations and experiences that merge and divide by age, social class, racialized-ethnicity, immigration status, age, religion, and other factors shows the limitations of generalizations (such as "girls are like this ... boys are like this") that abstract gender from lived contexts.

AAUW Educational Foundation Staff

Pamela Haag, Ph.D., is the director of research at the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation. She has been involved in conceptualizing and conducting research for the Foundation on many themes related to gender, equity, and education, including *Separated by Sex: A Critical Look at Single-Sex Education for Girls* (1998), a study of single-sex education in the United States, and *Tech-Savvy: Educating Girls in the New Computer Culture* (2000), a report on gender, education, and the computer culture. One of her recent publications, *Voices of a Generation: Teenage Girls on Sex, School, and Self* (1999), is based on qualitative research that examines girls' views of adolescent life. She is also the author of *Consent: Sexual Rights and the Transformation of American Liberalism* (1999), a book based on her doctoral dissertation research. Since joining the Foundation, Haag has spoken extensively with the media and at conferences on a variety of themes related to gender and education.

Haag received her doctorate from Yale University in 1995. She has held fellowships from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Mellon Foundation, and the Pembroke Center for Research on Women at Brown University, among others.

AAUW Equity Library

Beyond the "Gender Wars": A Conversation About Girls, Boys, and Education
Report of the key insights presented during a symposium convened by the AAUW Educational Foundation in September 2000 to foster a discussion among scholars who study both girls' and boys' experiences in and out of school. Participants share their insights about gender identity and difference, challenge popular views of girls' and boys' behavior, and explore the meaning of equitable education for the 21st century. 60 pages/2001.
$8.95 members/$9.95 nonmembers

¡Sí, Se Puede! Yes, We Can: Latinas in School
by Angela Ginorio and Michelle Huston
Comprehensive look at the status of Latina girls in the U.S. public education system. Report explores conflicts between institutional expectations and the realities of student lives and discusses the social, cultural, and community factors that affect Hispanic education. Available in English and Spanish. 84 pages/2001.
$11.95 members/$12.95 nonmembers

A License For Bias: Sex Discrimination, Schools, and Title IX
Examines uneven efforts to implement the 1972 civil rights law that protects some 70 million students and employees from sex discrimination in schools and universities. The analysis of non-sports-related complaints filed between 1993 and 1997 pinpoints problems that hamper enforcement and includes recommendations for Congress, the Office for Civil Rights, and educational institutions. 84 pages/2000.
$11.95 members/$12.95 nonmembers.
Published by the AAUW Legal Advocacy Fund.

Community Coalitions Manual With Lessons Learned From the Girls Can! Project
A comprehensive guide for establishing and sustaining effective coalition-based programs. Covers volunteer recruitment, project planning, evaluation, fundraising, and public relations, with contact information for more than 200 organizations, and lessons learned from the Girls Can! Community Coalitions Projects, a nationwide gender equity program. 172 pages/2000.
$14.95 AAUW members/$16.95 nonmembers.

Tech-Savvy: Educating Girls in the New Computer Age
Explores girls' and teachers' perspectives of today's computer culture and technology use at school, home, and the workplace. Presents recommendations for broadening access to computers for girls and others who don't fit the "male hacker/computer geek" stereotype. 84 pages/2000.
$11.95 members/$12.95 nonmembers.

Voices of a Generation: Teenage Girls on Sex, School, and Self
Compares the comments of roughly 2,100 girls nationwide on peer pressure, sexuality, the media, and school. The girls participated in AAUW teen forums called Sister-to-Sister Summits. The report explores differences in responses by race, ethnicity, and age and offers action proposals to solve common problems. 95 pages/1999.
$13.95 members/ $14.95 nonmembers.

Gaining a Foothold: Women's Transitions Through Work and College
Examines how and why women make changes in their lives through education. The report profiles three groups—women going from high school to college, from high school to work, and from work back to formal education—using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Findings include an analysis of women's educational decisions, aspirations, and barriers. 100 pages/1999.
$11.95 members/ $12.95 nonmembers.

Gender Gaps: Where Schools Still Fail Our Children
Measures schools' mixed progress toward gender equity and excellence since the 1992 publication of *How Schools Shortchange Girls*. Report compares student course enrollments, tests, grades, risks, and resiliency by race and class as well as gender. It finds some gains in girls' achievement, some areas where boys—not girls—lag, and some areas, like technology, where needs have not yet been addressed. 150 pages/1998.
$12.95 members/ $13.95 nonmembers.

Gender Gaps Executive Summary
Overview of *Gender Gaps* report with selected findings, tables, bibliography, and recommendations for educators and policy-makers. 24 pages/1998.
$6.95 members/$7.95 nonmembers.

Separated By Sex: A Critical Look at Single-Sex Education for Girls
The foremost educational scholars on single-sex education in grades K-12 compare findings on whether girls learn better apart from boys. The report, including a literature review and a summary of a forum convened by the AAUW Educational Foundation, challenges the popular idea that single-sex education is better for girls than coeducation. 102 pages/1998.
$11.95 AAUW members/$12.95 nonmembers.

Gender and Race on the Campus and in the School:
Beyond Affirmative Action Symposium Proceedings
A compilation of papers presented at AAUW's June 1997 college/university symposium in Anaheim, California. Symposium topics include K-12 curricula and student achievement, positive gender and race awareness in elementary and secondary school, campus climate and multiculturalism, higher education student retention and success, and the nexus of race and gender in higher education curricula and classrooms.
428 pages/1997.
$19.95 AAUW members/$21.95 nonmembers.

Girls in the Middle: Working to Succeed in School
Engaging study of middle school girls and the strategies they use to meet the challenges of adolescence. Report links girls' success to school reforms like team teaching and cooperative learning, especially where these are used to address gender issues.
116 pages/1996.
$12.95 AAUW members /$14.95 nonmembers.

Growing Smart: What's Working for Girls in School—Executive Summary and Action Guide
Illustrated summary of academic report identifying themes and approaches that promote girls' achievement and healthy development. Based on review of more than 500 studies and reports. Includes action strategies, program resource list, and firsthand accounts of some program participants. 48 pages/1995.
$10.95 AAUW members/$12.95 nonmembers.

How Schools Shortchange Girls: The AAUW Report
A startling examination of how girls are disadvantaged in America's schools, grades K-12. Includes recommendations for educators and policy-makers as well as concrete strategies for change. 224 pages/Marlowe, 1995.
$11.95 AAUW members/$12.95 nonmembers.

Hostile Hallways: The AAUW Survey on Sexual Harassment in America's Schools
The first national study of sexual harassment in school, based on the experiences of 1,632 students in grades 8 through 11. Gender and ethnic/racial (African American, Hispanic, and white) data breakdowns included. Commissioned by the AAUW Educational Foundation and conducted by Louis Harris and Associates. 28 pages/1993.
$8.95 AAUW members/$11.95 nonmembers.

SchoolGirls: Young Women, Self-Esteem, and the Confidence Gap
Riveting book by journalist Peggy Orenstein in association with AAUW shows how girls in two racially and economically diverse California communities suffer the painful plunge in self-esteem documented in *Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America.*
384 pages/Doubleday, 1994.
$11.95 AAUW members/$12.95 nonmembers.

Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America: Executive Summary
Summary of the 1991 poll that assesses self-esteem, educational experiences, and career aspirations of girls and boys ages 9-15. Revised edition reviews poll's impact, offers action strategies, and highlights survey results with charts and graphs.
20 pages/1994.
$8.95 AAUW members/$11.95 nonmembers.

Order Form

Name_____ AAUW membership # (if applicable)_____

Street_____

City/State/ZIP _____

Daytime phone (_____)_____ E-mail _____

Item	Price Member/Nonmember	Quantity	Total
Beyond the "Gender Wars": A Conversation About Girls, Boys, and Education	$ 8.95/$ 9.95	_____	_____
¡Sí, Se Puede! Yes, We Can: Latinas in School (Check one: ❑ English or ❑ Spanish)	$11.95/$12.95	_____	_____
A License for Bias: Sex Discrimination, Schools, and Title IX	$11.95/$12.95	_____	_____
Community Coalitions Manual	$14.95/$16.95	_____	_____
Tech-Savvy: Educating Girls in the New Computer Age	$11.95/$12.95	_____	_____
Voices of a Generation: Teenage Girls on Sex, School, and Self	$13.95/$14.95	_____	_____
Gaining a Foothold: Women's Transitions Through Work and College	$11.95/$12.95	_____	_____
Gender Gaps: Where Schools Still Fail Our Children	$12.95/$13.95	_____	_____
Gender Gaps Executive Summary	$ 6.95/$ 7.95	_____	_____
Separated by Sex: A Critical Look at Single-Sex Education for Girls	$11.95/$12.95	_____	_____
Gender and Race on the Campus and in the School	$19.95/$21.95	_____	_____
Girls in the Middle: Working to Succeed in School	$12.95/$14.95	_____	_____
Growing Smart Executive Summary and Action Guide	$10.95/$12.95	_____	_____
How Schools Shortchange Girls: The AAUW Report	$11.95/$12.95	_____	_____
Hostile Hallways: The AAUW Survey on Sexual Harassment in America's Schools	$ 8.95/$11.95	_____	_____
SchoolGirls: Young Women, Self-Esteem, and the Confidence Gap	$11.95/$12.95	_____	_____
Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America—Executive Summary	$ 8.95/$11.95	_____	_____
		Subtotal ($25 minimum):	_____
		Your State Sales Tax:	_____
		Shipping/Handling (see chart below):	_____
		Total:	_____

For bulk pricing on orders of 10 or more, call 800/225-9998 ext. 533.
For rush orders, call 800/225-9998 ext. 533. A $5 fee plus actual shipping charges will apply.
Shipments to foreign countries are sent surface rate and postage is charged at cost plus a $15 handling charge.
All applicable duties and taxes are paid by customer.
AAUW Federal Identification Number: 53-0025390.

Shipping and Handling (based on order size)	
$25-$49.99	$7.95
$50-$99.99	$8.95
$100-$249.99	$10.95
$250-$350	$15.95
Over $350	$4.95 plus 5% of subtotal

❑ Check/Money Order
(Please make payable in U.S. currency to Newton Manufacturing Co. Do not send cash.)

❑ MasterCard ❑ VISA

Card #_ _ _ _ - _ _ _ _ - _ _ _ _ - _ _ _ _ Expiration_____

Name on card _____

Cardholder signature _____

SATISFACTION GUARANTEED: If you are not completely satisfied with your purchase, please return it within 90 days for exchange, credit, or refund. Videos are returnable only if defective and for replacement only.

FOR MAIL ORDERS, SEND THIS FORM TO
AAUW Sales Office
Newton Manufacturing Co.
P.O. Box 927
Newton, IA 50208-0927

FOR TELEPHONE ORDERS,
CALL 800/225-9998 ext. 533
FAX 800/500-5118

FOR ONLINE ORDERS, GO TO www.aauw.org

AAUW EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION

Board of Directors 1999-2001
Sharon Schuster, President
Mary Ellen Smyth, Development Vice President
Dian Belanger, Program Vice President
Elizabeth "Beth" Norris, Secretary
Marilyn Arp, Finance Vice President
Sally Chamberlain
Gwendolyn Dungy
Julie Englund
Jo Harberson
Jo Herber
Ruth Jurenko
Judi Kneece
Carole Kubota
Susan Nenstiel
Ann Pollina
Jeanie Page Randall
Carol Stull

Sandy Bernard, AAUW President, ex officio
Jacqueline E. Woods, Executive Director, ex officio

Project Staff
Pamela Haag, Director of Research
Tara Kelley-Baker, Research Associate
Amy Beckrich, Research Assistant
Amy Robb, Librarian

The AAUW Educational Foundation provides funds to advance education, research, and self-development for women and to foster equity and positive societal change.

In principle and in practice, the AAUW Educational Foundation values and supports diversity. There shall be no barriers to full participation in this organization on the basis of gender, race, creed, age, sexual orientation, national origin, disability, or class.

Beyond the "Gender Wars"

A Conversation about Girls, Boys, and Education

Susan Bailey

Patricia Campbell

Beatrix Chu Clewell

James Garbarino

Patricia Horsch

Michael Kimmel

Lynn Phillips

William Pollack

Barrie Thorne

Report of the key insights presented during a symposium convened by the AAUW Educational Foundation in September 2000 to foster a discussion among scholars who study both girls' and boys' experiences in and out of school. Participants share their insights about gender identity and difference, challenge popular views of girls' and boys' behavior, and explore the meaning of equitable education for the 21st century.

AAUW Educational Foundation

1111 Sixteenth St. N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

BEST COPY AVAILABLE